



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,725	06/20/2005	Ralf Reski	STURK0019	7533
24203	7590	09/05/2007	EXAMINER	
GRIFFIN & SZIPL, PC			RAGHU, GANAPATHIRAM	
SUITE PH-1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2300 NINTH STREET, SOUTH			1652	
ARLINGTON, VA 22204			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/539,725	RESKI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ganapathirama Raghu	1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 38-79 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 38-79 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 38-79 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I: Claims 38-50 and 78, drawn to a transformed bryophyte cell.

Group II: Claims 51-66 and 79, drawn to a method of producing at least a bryophyte cell wherein fucT and xyLT activity is substantially reduced and said cell further comprises a nucleotide sequence operably linked to an exogenous promoter that drives expression in said bryophyte cell.

Group III: Claims 67-77, drawn to a nucleic acid vector suitable for producing at least a bryophyte cell wherein fucosyl and xylosyl transferase nucleotide sequences are dysfunctional.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: The technical feature linking Groups I-III appears to be that they all relate to a transformed bryophyte cell and nucleic acid vector suitable for producing a bryophyte cell expressing heterologous polypeptides. However, transformed bryophyte cell and nucleic acid vector suitable for producing a bryophyte cell expressing heterologous polypeptides were known in the art. For example, Schaefer et al., 2001 teach transformed bryophyte cell and nucleic acid vector suitable for producing a bryophyte cell

Art Unit: 1652

expressing heterologous polypeptides (pages 1433-1434), which anticipates claims 51-66 and 79.

Therefore Groups I-III share no special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Accordingly, Groups I-III are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

These inventions lack Unity of Invention for the reasons given above. Furthermore, each invention has acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter and, thus, searching more than one invention would be a burden on the Office. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Group I and II, claims 50, 59 and 65: glycosylated polypeptide is selected from the group consisting of:

- 1) human insulin,
- 2) preproinsulin,
- 3) VEGF,
- 4) proinsulin,
- 5) glucagon,
- 6) alpha-interferon,
- 7) beta-interferon,
- 8) gamma-interferon,
- 9) Factor VII,

- 10) Factor VIII,
- 11) Factor IX,
- 12) Factor X,
- 13) Factor XI,
- 14) Factor XII,
- 15) luteinising hormone,
- 16) follicle stimulating hormone,
- 17) prolactin,
- 18) oxytocin,
- 19) epidermal growth factor,
- 20) platelet-derived growth factor,
- 21) granulocyte colony stimulating factor,
- 22) thyroid stimulating hormone,
- 23) adrenocorticotropic hormone,
- 24) calcitonin,
- 25) parathyroid hormone,
- 26) somatostatin,
- 27) erythropoietin (EPO),
- 28) beta-glucocerebrosidase,
- 29) amidases,
- 30) amylases,
- 31) carbohydrases,

Art Unit: 1652

- 32) cellulase,
- 33) dextranase,
- 34) esterases,
- 35) glucanases,
- 36) glucoamylases,
- 37) lactase,
- 38) lipase,
- 39) pepsin,
- 40) peptidases,
- 41) phytases,
- 42) proteases,
- 43) pectinases
- 44) haemoglobin,
- 45) serum albumin,
- 46) collagen,
- 47) casein
- 48) whey proteins
- 49) soya proteins
- 50) gluten
- 51) egg albumin

The species of Groups I and II (claims 50, 59 and 60) have either different structures or encode genes with different structures and are patentably distinct, searching for all the species

Art Unit: 1652

would impose a serious search burden. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution from, i.e., a glycosylated polypeptide from 1) to 51), on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, **Group I and II, claims 38-49, 51-57, 60-64 and 66** are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1652

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Rejoinder of restricted inventions

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of a rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet the criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. 103(b), 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or otherwise include the limitation of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. 804.01.

Final Comments

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1652

To insure that each document is properly filed in the electronic file wrapper, it is requested that each of amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims, Applicants' remarks, requests for extension of time, and any other distinct papers be submitted on separate pages.

It is also requested that Applicants identify support, within the original application, for any amendments to the claims and specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ganapathirama Raghu whose telephone number is 571-272-4533. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4.30 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ganapathirama Raghu, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1652
August 25, 2007.

Rebecca E. Rountree
REBECCA E. ROUNTREE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1652
1652